



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,262	06/30/2006	Shisei Goto	505-44	3705
<div>1609 7590 09/09/2009</div> <div>ROYLANCE, ABRAMS, BERDO & GOODMAN, L.L.P.</div> <div>1300 19TH STREET, N.W.</div> <div>SUITE 600</div> <div>WASHINGTON,, DC 20036</div>				
EXAMINER				
CALANDRA, ANTHONY J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1791				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/09/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Art Unit: 1791

Advisory Action

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Apparatus claims 15-18 and 22 based on SOYOMA: The examiner agrees that SOYOMA fails to disclose the baffle plate located upstream of the jet. However, this claim limitation has not been entered.

The applicant argues a distinction between a fluid jet from a liquid. This claim limitation has not been entered. Applicant states that since SOLONITSYN states that air is required and this new limitation would make SOLONITSYN deficient. Applicant points to example 15 of SOLONITSYN of requiring air added through nozzles in the effuser. The requirement for air is only one embodiment of SOLONITSYN, example 15 SOLONITSYN is treating "wastewater". It appears that liquids can also be injected through the same holes as per example 3 of SOLONITSYN. Additionally the comprising language does not prevent the use of air in conjunction with the liquid jet. Applicant argues that SOLONITSYN requires a cylindrical solid body to generate cavitation. The examiner agrees that SOLONITSYN requires this element. But it is not clear how the applicant's language limits the use of said element or the additional use of element (17) in light of the 'comprising' language used therein.

Applicant finally argues the baffle plate limitation for SOLONITSYN is not met for the independent apparatus claim. Upon consideration of the applicant's arguments and review of the SOLONITSYN reference, the examiner agrees with the applicant. The examiner misinterpreted the two dimensional drawing view of Figure 2 (15) to indicate flat plates, while in fact they were nozzles connected to pipes which are not plates. Further, there is no teaching in SOLONITSYN to suggest a flat baffle plate upstream. Therefore the examiner withdraws the rejections to claims 15-24 based on SOLONITSYN. Claims 15-18 and 22 stand rejected based on SOYOMA. Claims 19-21, 23 and 24 are objected to based on there dependency to instant claim 15.

/Anthony J Calandra/

Examiner, Art Unit 1791

/Steven P. Griffin/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791